

1                   **BENDAU & BENDAU PLLC**  
2 Clifford P. Bendau, II (030204)  
3 Christopher J. Bendau (032981)  
4 P.O. Box 97066  
5 Phoenix, Arizona 85060  
6 Telephone: (480) 382-5176  
7 Facsimile: (480) 304-3805  
8 Email: cliffordbendau@bendaulaw.com  
9                    chris@bendaulaw.com  
10                  *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

11                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
12                   DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

13                  **Noé Acosta,**

14                  Plaintiff,

15                  No.

16                  vs.

17                  **VERIFIED COMPLAINT**

18                  **Arizona Mobile Tire Service, LLC**, an  
19                  Arizona limited liability company, and  
20                  **Shirley Coronado and John Doe**  
21                  **Coronado**, a married couple,

22                  Defendants.

23                  Plaintiff, Noé Acosta (“Plaintiff” or “Noé Acosta”), sues the Defendants Arizona  
24                  Mobile Tire Service, LLC and Shirley Coronado and John Doe Coronado, (collectively  
25                  “Defendants”) and alleges as follows:

26                   **PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

27                  1.        This is an action for unpaid minimum wages, liquidated damages,  
28                  attorneys’ fees, costs, and interest under the Fair Labor Standards Act (“FLSA”), 29  
29                  U.S.C. § 201, et seq.; unpaid minimum wage under the Arizona Minimum Wage Act  
30                  (“AMWA”), Arizona Revised Statutes (“A.R.S.”) Title 23, Chapter 2, Article 8; and  
31                  32

1 unpaid wages under the Arizona Wage Act (“AWA”), A.R.S. Title 23, Chapter 2, Article  
2

3 7.

4 2. The FLSA was enacted “to protect all covered workers from substandard  
5 wages and oppressive working hours.” Barrentine v. Ark Best Freight Sys. Inc., 450 U.S.  
6 728, 739 (1981). Under the FLSA, employers must pay all non-exempt employees a  
7 minimum wage of pay for all time spent working during their regular 40-hour  
8 workweeks. See 29 U.S.C. § 206(a).

9 3. The AMWA, A.R.S. § 23-363, et seq., establishes a minimum wage within  
10 the State of Arizona.

11 4. The AWA, A.R.S. § 23-350, et seq., establishes standards for wage  
12 payments to employees within the State of Arizona.

13 14 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

15 5. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and  
16 29 U.S.C. § 201, *et seq.* because this civil action arises under the Constitution and law of  
17 the United States. This Court also has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant 28 U.S.C. §  
18 1367 because the state law claims asserted herein are so related to claims in this action  
19 over which this Court has subject matter jurisdiction that they form part of the same case  
20 or controversy under Article III of the United States Constitution.

21 6. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331(b)(ii) because  
22 acts giving rise to the claims of Plaintiff occurred within the District of Arizona, and  
23 Defendants regularly conduct business in and have engaged in the wrongful conduct  
24 alleged herein – and, thus, are subject to personal jurisdiction in – this judicial district.

## PARTIES

1  
2       7. At all times material to the matters alleged in this Complaint, Plaintiff was  
3 an individual residing in Maricopa County, Arizona, and is a former employee of  
4 Defendants.  
5

6       8. At all material times, Arizona Mobile Tire Service, LLC is a limited  
7 liability company duly licensed to transact business in the State of Arizona. At all  
8 material times, Defendant Arizona Mobile Tire Service, LLC does business, has offices,  
9 and/or maintains agents for the transaction of its customary business in Maricopa County,  
10 Arizona.  
11

12       9. At all relevant times, Defendant Arizona Mobile Tire Service, LLC owned  
13 and operated as “Arizona Mobile Tire Service,” a retail and wholesale tire distributor in  
14 Phoenix, AZ.  
15

16       10. Under the FLSA, Defendant Arizona Mobile Tire Service, LLC is an  
17 employer. The FLSA defines “employer” as any person who acts directly or indirectly in  
18 the interest of an employer in relation to an employee. At all relevant times, Defendant  
19 Arizona Mobile Tire Service, LLC had the authority to hire and fire employees,  
20 supervised and controlled work schedules or the conditions of employment, determined  
21 the rate and method of payment, and maintained employment records in connection with  
22 Plaintiff’s employment with Defendants. As a person who acted in the interest of  
23 Defendant in relation to the company’s employees, Defendant Arizona Mobile Tire  
24 Service, LLC is subject to liability under the FLSA.  
25  
26  
27

1       11. Defendants Shirley Coronado and John Doe Coronado are, upon  
2 information and belief, husband and wife. They have caused events to take place giving  
3 rise to the claims in this Complaint as to which their marital community is fully liable.  
4 Shirley Coronado and John Doe Coronado are owners of Arizona Mobile Tire Service,  
5 LLC and were at all relevant times Plaintiff's employers as defined by the FLSA, 29  
6 U.S.C. § 203(d).

8       12. Under the FLSA, Defendants Shirley Coronado and John Doe Coronado  
9 are employers. The FLSA defines "employer" as any person who acts directly or  
10 indirectly in the interest of an employer in relation to an employee. At all relevant times,  
11 Defendants Shirley Coronado and John Doe Coronado had the authority to hire and fire  
12 employees, supervised and controlled work schedules or the conditions of employment,  
13 determined the rate and method of payment, and maintained employment records in  
14 connection with Plaintiff's employment with Defendants. As persons who acted in the  
15 interest of Defendant Arizona Mobile Tire Service, LLC in relation to the company's  
16 employees, Defendants Shirley Coronado and John Doe Coronado are subject to  
17 individual liability under the FLSA.

20       13. Plaintiff is further informed, believes, and therefore alleges that each of the  
21 Defendants herein gave consent to, ratified, and authorized the acts of all other  
22 Defendants, as alleged herein.

24       14. Defendants, and each of them, are sued in both their individual and  
25 corporate capacities.

27

1       15. Defendants are jointly and severally liable for the injuries and damages  
2 sustained by Plaintiff.

3       16. At all relevant times, Plaintiff was an “employee” of Defendants as defined  
4 by the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201, *et seq.*

5       17. The provisions set forth in the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201, *et seq.*, apply to  
6 Defendants.

7       18. At all relevant times, Defendants were and continue to be “employers” as  
8 defined by the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201, *et seq.*

9       19. The provisions set forth in the A.R.S. Title 23, Articles 7 and 8 apply to  
10 Defendants.

11       20. At all relevant times, Plaintiff was an “employee” of Defendants as defined  
12 by A.R.S. § 23-362.

13       21. At all relevant times, Defendants were and continue to be “employers” of  
14 Plaintiff as defined by A.R.S. § 23-362.

15       22. Defendants individually and/or through an enterprise or agent, directed and  
16 exercised control over Plaintiff’s work and wages at all relevant times.

17       23. Plaintiff, in his work for Defendants, was employed by an enterprise  
18 engaged in commerce that had annual gross sales of at least \$500,000.

19       24. At all relevant times, Plaintiff, in his work for Defendants, was engaged in  
20 commerce or the production of goods for commerce.

21       25. At all relevant times, Plaintiff, in his work for Defendants, was engaged in  
22 interstate commerce.

26. Plaintiff, in his work for Defendant, regularly handled goods produced or transported in interstate commerce.

## **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

27. Defendants own and/or operate as Arizona Mobile Tire Service, an enterprise located in Maricopa County, Arizona.

28. Plaintiff was hired by Defendants in approximately August 2021.

29. At all relevant times, Plaintiff worked for Defendants through approximately September, 2021.

30. At all relevant times, in his work for Defendants, Plaintiff worked as a manual laborer.

31. Defendants, in their sole discretion, paid Plaintiff \$15 per hour.

32. Defendants classified Plaintiff as W-2 employee.

33 At all relevant times Defendants paid Plaintiff on a bi-weekly basis

34. During his final pay period of work with Defendants, Plaintiff worked two workweeks

35. Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff any wages whatsoever for the final two workweeks of his employment with Defendants.

36. Therefore, for the final two workweeks that Plaintiff worked for Defendants, Defendants paid Plaintiff no wages whatsoever.

37. During Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, he had worked using an Individual Taxpayer Identification Number ("ITIN")

1           38. In or about September 2021, Plaintiff discovered that his ITIN had expired  
2 and needed to be renewed.

3           39. As result of learning that his ITIN had expired, Plaintiff informed  
4 Defendants that he would no longer work for them until he renewed his ITIN.

5           40. In response, Defendants demanded that Plaintiff continue to work for them,  
6 despite his ITIN having expired, because they needed his labor.

7           41. In response, Plaintiff agreed to continue to perform work for Defendants.

8           42. On or around the date that Defendants were supposed to pay Plaintiff's  
9 final paycheck, Defendants refused to pay Plaintiff the wages due and owing to them,  
10 stating to Plaintiff that they would not pay him until he received a renewed ITIN.

11           43. Plaintiff thereafter contacted the Internal Revenue Service to expedite the  
12 renewal of his ITIN. In response, the Internal Revenue Service stated that, because of the  
13 COVID-19 pandemic, they were experiencing delays and would not be able to renew  
14 Plaintiff's ITIN for some time. However, the agent with whom Plaintiff spoke stated that  
15 his ITIN remained the same, and that he could continue to accept payment from  
16 Defendants using his otherwise expired ITIN.

17           44. Despite this, Defendants continued to withhold the wages due and owing  
18 Plaintiff for the final two workweeks of his employment.

19           45. To date, Defendants have still paid no wages whatsoever to Plaintiff for  
20 such hours worked.

1           46. As a result of not having paid any wage whatsoever to Plaintiff during his  
2 final two workweeks with Defendants, Defendants failed to pay the applicable minimum  
3 wage to Plaintiff.

4           47. As a result of Defendants' willful failure to compensate Plaintiff any wage  
5 whatsoever for such hours worked, Defendants violated 29 U.S.C. § 206(a).

6           48. As a result of Defendants' willful failure to compensate Plaintiff any wage  
7 whatsoever for such hours worked, Defendants violated the AMWA, A.R.S. § 23-363.

8           49. As a result of Defendants' willful failure to compensate Plaintiff any wage  
9 whatsoever for such hours worked, Defendants violated the AWA, A.R.S., § 23-351.

10           50. Plaintiff was a non-exempt employee.

11           51. Defendants knew that – or acted with reckless disregard as to whether –  
12 their refusal or failure to properly compensate Plaintiff his final paycheck would violate  
13 federal and state law, and Defendants were aware of the FLSA minimum wage  
14 requirements during Plaintiff's employment. As such, Defendants' conduct constitutes a  
15 willful violation of the FLSA and the AMWA.

16           52. Defendants refused and/or failed to properly disclose to or apprise Plaintiff  
17 of his rights under the FLSA.

18           53. Plaintiff is a covered employee within the meaning of the FLSA.

19           54. Defendants individually and/or through an enterprise or agent, directed and  
20 exercised control over Plaintiff's work and wages at all relevant times.

21           55. Due to Defendants' illegal wage practices, Plaintiff is entitled to recover  
22 from Defendants compensation for unpaid minimum wages, an additional amount equal

1 amount as liquidated damages, interest, and reasonable attorney's fees and costs of this  
2 action under 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

3 56. Due to Defendants' illegal wage practices, Plaintiff is entitled to recover  
4 from Defendants compensation for unpaid wages, an additional amount equal to twice the  
5 unpaid minimum wages as liquidated damages, interest, and reasonable attorney's fees  
6 and costs of this action under A.R.S § 23-363.

7 57. Due to Defendants' illegal wage practices, Plaintiff is entitled to recover  
8 from Defendants compensation for his unpaid wages at an hourly rate, to be proven at  
9 trial, in an amount that is treble the amount of his unpaid wages, plus interest thereon,  
10 and his costs incurred under A.R.S. § 23-355.

11 13 **COUNT ONE: FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT**  
14 **FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGE**

15 58. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all allegations in all  
16 preceding paragraphs.

17 59. As a result of not paying Plaintiff any wage whatsoever for the final pay  
18 period of his employment, Defendant willfully failed or refused to pay Plaintiff the  
19 FLSA-mandated minimum wage.

20 60. Defendant's practice of willfully failing or refusing to pay Plaintiff at the  
21 required minimum wage rate violated the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 206(a).

22 61. Plaintiff is therefore entitled to compensation for the full applicable  
23 minimum wage at an hourly rate, to be proven at trial, plus an additional equal amount as  
24 liquidated damages, together with interest, reasonable attorney's fees, and costs.

**WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff, Noé Acosta, respectfully requests that this Court grant the following relief in Plaintiff's favor, and against Defendants:

- A. For the Court to declare and find that the Defendants committed one of more of the following acts:
  - i. Violated minimum wage provisions of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 206(a), by failing to pay proper minimum wages;
  - ii. Willfully violated minimum wage provisions of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 206(a) by willfully failing to pay proper minimum wages;
- B. For the Court to award Plaintiff's unpaid minimum wage damages, to be determined at trial;
- C. For the Court to award compensatory damages, including liquidated damages pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), to be determined at trial;
- D. For the Court to award prejudgment and post-judgment interest;
- E. For the Court to award Plaintiff reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of the action pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) and all other causes of action set forth herein;
- F. Such other relief as this Court shall deem just and proper.

## **COUNT TWO: ARIZONA MINIMUM WAGE ACT FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGE**

24 62. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all allegations in all  
25 preceding paragraphs.

1       63.    As a result of not paying Plaintiff any wage whatsoever for the final pay  
2 period of his employment, Defendant willfully failed or refused to pay Plaintiff the  
3 Arizona minimum wage.

4       64.    Defendant's practice of willfully failing or refusing to pay Plaintiff at the  
5 required minimum wage rate violated the AMWA, 23-363.

6       65.    Plaintiff is therefore entitled to compensation for the full applicable  
7 minimum wage at an hourly rate, to be proven at trial, plus an additional amount equal to  
8 twice the underpaid wages as liquidated damages, together with interest, reasonable  
9 attorney's fees, and costs.

10      **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff, Noé Acosta, respectfully requests that this Court grant  
11 the following relief in Plaintiff's favor, and against Defendants:

12      A.    For the Court to declare and find that the Defendant committed one or more  
13           of the following acts:

14       i.      Violated minimum wage provisions of the AMWA, A.R.S. § 23-  
15                   363, by failing to pay proper minimum wages;

16       ii.     Willfully violated minimum wage provisions of the AMWA, A.R.S.  
17                   § 23-363 by willfully failing to pay proper minimum wages;

18      B.    For the Court to award Plaintiff's unpaid minimum wage damages, to be  
19           determined at trial;

20      C.    For the Court to award compensatory damages, including liquidated  
21           damages pursuant to A.R.S. § 23-364, to be determined at trial;

22      D.    For the Court to award prejudgment and post-judgment interest;

- 1 E. For the Court to award Plaintiff reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of the
- 2 action pursuant to A.R.S. § 23-364 and all other causes of action set forth
- 3 herein;
- 4 F. Such other relief as this Court shall deem just and proper.

5

6 **COUNT THREE: ARIZONA WAGE ACT**  
**FAILURE TO PAY WAGES DUE AND OWING**

7

8 66. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all allegations in all  
9 preceding paragraphs.

10 67. As a result of the allegations contained herein, Defendants did not  
11 compensate Plaintiff wages due and owing to him.

12 68. Defendants engaged in such conduct in direct violation of A.R.S. § 23-350.

13 69. As such, unpaid wages for such time Plaintiff worked are owed to Plaintiff  
14 for the entire time he was employed by Defendants.

16 70. Defendants knew that – or acted with reckless disregard as to whether –  
17 their refusal or failure to properly compensate Plaintiff over the course of his  
18 employment would violate federal and state law, and Defendants were aware of the  
19 Arizona Wage Act's requirements during Plaintiff's employment. As such, Defendants'  
20 conduct constitutes a willful violation of the Arizona Wage Act.

22 71. Plaintiff is therefore entitled to compensation for his unpaid wages at an  
23 hourly rate, to be proven at trial, in an amount that is treble the amount of his unpaid  
24 wages, plus interest thereon, and his costs incurred.

**WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff, Noé Acosta, requests that this Court grant the following relief in Plaintiff's favor, and against Defendants:

- A. For the Court to declare and find that the Defendants violated the unpaid wage provisions of A.R.S. § 23-350, et seq., by failing to pay wages due and owing to Plaintiff;
- B. For the Court to award an amount that is treble Plaintiff's unpaid wages pursuant to A.R.S. § 23-355, in amounts to be determined at trial;
- C. For the Court to award prejudgment and post-judgment interest on any damages awarded;
- D. For the Court to award Plaintiff's reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of the action and all other causes of action set forth in this Complaint; and
- E. Such other relief as this Court deems just and proper.

**JURY TRIAL DEMAND**

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 14<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2022.

## BENDAU & BENDAU PLLC

By: /s/ Clifford P. Bendau, II  
Clifford P. Bendau, II  
Christopher J. Bendau  
Attorney for Plaintiff

## **VERIFICATION**

Plaintiff, Noé Acosta, declares under penalty of perjury that he has read the foregoing Verified Complaint and is familiar with the contents thereof. The matters asserted therein are true and based on his personal knowledge, except as to those matters stated upon information and belief, and, as to those matters, he believes them to be true.

DocuSigned by:  
Noe Acosta  
A818E18TE5C844C...  
Noe Acosta